

NPS55-80-029

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
Monterey, California



STRUCTURAL REDUNDANCY IN  
LARGE-SCALE OPTIMIZATION MODELS

Gordon H. Bradley  
Gerald G. Brown  
Naval Postgraduate School

Glenn W. Graves  
University of California  
Los Angeles

November 1980

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Prepared for:

FedDocs D 208.14/2  
NPS-55-80-029

Office of Naval Research  
Washington, Virginia 22217

Fed 11/1968  
D 208.14/2  
T 1155-80-029

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
Monterey, California

Rear Admiral J. J. Ekelund  
Superintendent

David A. Schrady  
Acting Provost

This work was supported in part by the Office of Naval  
Research, Code 434, Alexandria, VA.

Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.

Prepared by:

## UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY  
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
READ INSTRUCTIONS  
MONTEREY BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		
1. REPORT NUMBER NPS55-80-029	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Structural Redundancy in Large-Scale Optimization Models	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report	
7. AUTHOR(s) Bradley, Gordon H. Brown, Gerald G. Graves, Glenn W.	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, Ca. 92940	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 61153N, RR014-07-01, NR047-144 N0001480WR00020	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Chief of Naval Research Arlington Virginia 22217	12. REPORT DATE November 1980	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	13. NUMBER OF PAGES	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)	
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Large-Scale Optimization; Decomposition; Basis Factorization; Networks; Generalized Upper Bounds; Mixed Integer Optimization		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper discusses automatic detection and exploitation of structural redundancy in large-scale mathematical programming models. From our perspective, such redundancy represents embedded special structure which can give significant insight to the model proponent as well as greatly reduce solution effort. We report experiments with real-life linear programming (LP) and mixed-integer (MIP) models in which various methods are developed and tested as integral modules in an optimization system	(over)	

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

of advanced design. We seek to understand the modelling implications of these embedded redundancies as well as to exploit them during actual optimization. The latter goal places heavy emphasis on efficient, as well as effective, identification techniques for economic application to large models. Several (polynomially bounded) heuristic detection algorithms are presented from our work. In addition, bounds are reported for the maximum row dimension of the more complex structures. These bounds are useful for objectively estimating the quality of heuristically derived assessments of structural redundancy. Finally, some additional suggestions are made for analyzing nonlinear programming (NLP) models.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

STRUCTURAL REDUNDANCY IN LARGE-SCALE OPTIMIZATION MODELS

Gordon H. Bradley  
Gerald G. Brown  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California  
93940 USA

Glenn W. Graves  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California  
90024 USA

This paper discusses automatic detection and exploitation of structural redundancy in large-scale mathematical programming models. From our perspective, such redundancy represents embedded special structure which can give significant insight to the model proponent as well as greatly reduce solution effort. We report experiments with real-life linear programming (LP) and mixed-integer (MIP) models in which various methods are developed and tested as integral modules in an optimization system of advanced design. We seek to understand the modelling implications of these embedded redundancies as well as to exploit them during actual optimization. The latter goal places heavy emphasis on efficient, as well as effective, identification techniques for economic application to large models. Several (polynomially bounded) heuristic detection algorithms are presented from our work. In addition, bounds are reported for the maximum row dimension of the more complex structures. These bounds are useful for objectively estimating the quality of heuristically derived assessments of structural redundancy. Finally, some additional suggestions are made for analyzing nonlinear programming (NLP) models.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

Automatic detection and exploitation of structural redundancy in large-scale linear programming (LP) (as well as mixed integer programming (MIP) and nonlinear) models has been one subject of a continuing research program conducted at the Naval Postgraduate School and UCLA over the past decade. This exposition draws from various results in that effort, and refers (sparingly) to significant work by other researchers. The references contain complete descriptions of these results for the interested reader.

Our scope is intentionally limited to automated methods of sufficient efficiency to enable us to economically apply them to real-world optimization problems. Thus, we consider only those approaches showing greatest promise for immediate practical application. Although the interpretations of embedded model redundancy can lend profound insights in their own right, we are equally interested in detecting errors in data preparation and model generation--mathematically mundane issues of fundamental importance to the practitioner.

In this context, our definition of structural redundancy includes not only features which permit reduction of effective problem size, but also those embedded special structures which invite application of special solution methods with enhanced efficiency. This somewhat expanded view of redundancy admits features which yield to, for instance, basis factorization or decomposition.

The sheer size of contemporary large-scale LP models presents significant computational difficulties, even for discovery of otherwise elementary structures (in the sense of formal complexity). Implementation of effective structural analysis procedures is primarily a matter of exercising large-scale data structures efficiently. As we shall see, though, these practical considerations can give significant theoretical guidance in the specification of efficiently achievable classes of model transformations.

That detection of embedded special structure can be of practical importance in actual model solution is undisputed. It is widely known that explicit simplex operations can be materially improved in efficiency by incorporation of basis factorization methods (e.g. Graves and McBride [12, 15]). The details of such modifications of the simplex procedure are not given here. However, the underlying themes of simplex factorization are the substitution of logic for floating point arithmetic, and separation of the apparent problem monolith into more manageable components.

This work deals primarily with row factorizations. The pervasive implied problem for row factorization is the identification of the *best* embedded structure from all those that may lie at hand in any particular model. Conventional wisdom differs as to the criterion for this discrimination among factorizations of the same class. However, it is generally accepted that the row dimensionality of the factorization serves as an excellent measure of effectiveness. In this sense, embedded special

structures fall naturally into a taxonomy implied by the intrinsic complexity of the associated maximum row identification problems.

We proceed with a discussion of several types of embedded special structures detectable by efficient polynomially bounded algorithms. These structures are considered in increasing order of maximum row identification complexity. We emphasize that *efficient* polynomial algorithms are operationally defined here as low-order polynomial in terms of intrinsic problem dimensions (e.g. number of rows, columns, and non-zero elements), and *not* in terms of the total volume of model information (e.g. total number of bits in all coefficients, ad nauseam).

## 2. OVERVIEW OF THE ANALYSIS

We are usually faced with the following practical situation. An LP (or MIP) is presented, typically in MPS format on magnetic tape. Some documentation and possibly solution experience is also provided, but the matrix generator and source data elements for the model are rarely at hand. The model is frequently sent to us because of some difficulty encountered in preliminary solution attempts.

Our efforts are devoted to two issues: Analysis of the LP, and solving it efficiently.

The analysis is initially focused on rather ordinary details, primarily establishing computer compatibility, and on review of gross problem statistics such as those shown in Table 1 for the sample problems we will discuss further. At this stage we attempt to detect outright disasters before investing more time and money.

For instance, we have frequently found that the actual LP bears little resemblance to the intended formulation due to matrix generator difficulties, human error, or data base failures. Even an LP which seems to follow its formulation template may exhibit superfluous objective functions, right hand sides, and so forth.

After the cursory review, a representative model is selected, set up and input to an internal data structure for detailed analysis. The input process is relatively expensive for large LP models, involving conversion of thousands of records. Row and column summary statistics are produced and reviewed. At this point, pathological coefficient scaling is frequently revealed; this is

TABLE 1

## SAMPLE LP (MIP) MODELS

## CONSTRAINTS

MODEL	CONSTRAINTS		COLUMNS		TOTAL	TOTAL	ORDERS OF MAG.
	TOTAL	EQUALITY	TOTAL	INTEGER			
NETTING	90	36	177	114	375	3	8
AIRLP	171	170	3,040	0	6,023	3	
COAL	171	0	3,753	0	7,506	6	
TRUCK	220	0	4,752	4,752	30,074	1	
CUPS	361	330	582	145	1,341	7	
FERT	606	559	9,024	0	40,484	8	
PIES	663	480	2,923	0	13,288	7	
PAD	695	160	3,934	0	13,459	7	
ELEC	785	462	2,800	0	8,462	6	
GAS	799	638	5,536	0	27,474	5	
PILOT	976	701	2,172	0	13,057	14	
FOAM	1,000	0	4,020	42	13,083	7	
LANG	1,236	665	1,425	0	22,028	3	
JCAP	2,487	310	3,849	560	9,510	$\geq 9$	
PAPER	3,529	2,456	6,543	0	32,644	6	
ODSAS	4,648	4,059	4,683	0	30,520	4	

## NON-ZERO COEFFICIENTS

sometimes caused by poor modeling, and occasionally by bad source data elements. For example, we have found at this point that unwanted model features (such as, say, production capacity constraints) have been "relaxed" in an ad hoc fashion by providing outrageous dummy coefficients (e.g. essentially infinite capacity or infinitesimal production rates). These redundancies, while innocently intended, can play havoc with LP solution procedures (this is especially true for MIP and nonlinear algorithms).

Next, we apply a set of *simple reductions* to the LP model. At this stage, we identify redundancies with two goals. First, we want to complete our "bottom-up" analysis of the model. However, we also seek to set the stage for actual model solution.

In this sense, we cannot (ordinarily) afford and we do not (routinely) apply at large scale reduction methods which are computationally equivalent to actual solution of the LP. Rather, we discover as much as possible about redundancy in the model by efficient, polynomially bounded static analysis not employing basis exchanges. From this we attempt to infer qualitatively the complete redundancy structure of the model at hand.

Also, we ignore structural features which have little or no bearing on our analysis or solution effort. For instance, we are indifferent about degeneracy, since our solution procedures exploit this delightful property (Graves [11]).

Similarly, we do seek certain properties which may make our solution procedures much more efficient, but which may not be so attractive to analysts using other methods. Among these properties are embedded generalized upper bounds (GUB) and net-

work, or pure network (NET) rows, for which our interest is particularly keen (Bradley, Brown and Graves [6], Brown and Graves [8], Graves and Van Roy [13]).

Actual solution of the model follows these analysis efforts unless we find that the model requires significant modification or managerial review. For models that merit solution, we see no reason to impose unreasonable restrictions on the model builder. That is, the responsibility for efficient solution is ours regardless of the redundancy structure found, as long as this redundancy is not in conflict with the intent of the modeler. Thus, all reductions must provide an equivalent solution to the model as originally posed, and can not require that the model be changed or severely modified externally (e.g. requiring general linear transformation of the formulation to suit the solver is out of the question).

### 3. DETAILS OF THE ANALYSIS

For analysis, the linear program is stored in a sparse data structure. Nonzero coefficients are stored along with the corresponding row index by column with access via column entry points. Each row and column has associated with it an external label, several coefficient values representing upper and lower bounds and ranges, and a coded tag giving the type of constraint (e.g. equation) or column and its status in the analysis.

Although conversion to a super-sparse data structure is subsequently required for the solution of the model, the sparse structure is much more convenient for analysis of the model composition and for model modifications. Very little auxiliary storage is required for the analysis and practical problems at large scale are routinely analyzed. The system is designed to operate on problems with up to 30,000 rows plus columns. (E.g. see Bradley, Brown and Galatas [4] for FORTRAN examples using these data structures.)

Our analysis is confined to reductions that do not change the feasible region. The analysis can also be called "orthogonal" in that the reduction tests are made on the current problem with no pivotal transformations actually performed. The reductions may show how to transform the problem by removing columns and constraints and by the elimination of columns (equivalent to pivoting), but the tests are applied only to the current representation of the problem.

The analysis is applied to a fully ranged and bounded linear program.

$$\min \sum_j c_j x_j$$

$$\text{s.t. } r_i \leq \sum_j a_{ij} x_j \leq r^i \quad \forall i \quad (\text{ranged constraints})$$

$$l_j \leq x_j \leq u_j \quad \forall j \quad (\text{simple bounds}) .$$

Some ranges and bounds may be missing (that is,  $+\infty$  or  $-\infty$ ).

### 3.1. Simple Reductions

*Singleton column.* If a column has a single nonzero coefficient, the column can be removed. The ranges of the constraint that contain the nonzero coefficient are modified to construct an equivalent problem.

*Fixed column.* If a column has been fixed at a certain value, or (equivalently) its upper and lower bounds are equal, it can be removed. The ranges of all constraints that have a nonzero coefficient in the removed column are modified.

*Vacuous columns.* Columns with no nonzero coefficients may be removed. The associated variable may assume any value between its upper and lower bounds.

*Inconsistent column.* Any column with its upper bound strictly less than its lower bound indicates that the linear program has no feasible solution.

*Free column.* A free column results from modeling a variable that has no upper or lower bound or by analysis that can show that neither the upper nor lower bound is necessary to define the feasible region.

*Singleton constraint.* If a constraint has a single nonzero coefficient, the constraint may be removed. The bounds of the column that contains the coefficient are modified. Simple bounds are often revealed this way when they are inadvertently expressed as explicit constraints.

*Redundant constraints.* A constraint is redundant if its removal does not change the feasible region. An examination of the bounds on columns with nonzero coefficients yields a test for a redundant constraint. For constraint  $i$  define

$$R^i = \sum_{a_{ij} > 0} a_{ij} u_j + \sum_{a_{ij} < 0} a_{ij} l_j ,$$

and

$$R_i = \sum_{a_{ij} > 0} a_{ij} l_j + \sum_{a_{ij} < 0} a_{ij} u_j .$$

A constraint is redundant if  $R^i \leq r^i$  and  $R_i \geq r_i$ . If only one inequality holds, the corresponding range can be eliminated (that is, set to  $\infty$  or  $-\infty$ ).

*Constraints that fix variables.* If  $R^i = r_i$  or  $R_i = r^i$  then each column with a nonzero coefficient in the constraint must be fixed at the appropriate bound in order for the constraint to be satisfied. The constraint can then be removed.

*Inconsistent constraints.* If  $R^i < r_i$  or  $R_i > r^i$ , then the LP has no feasible solution.

*Vacuous constraints.* Constraints with no nonzero coefficients may be removed. If  $r^i < 0$  or  $r_i > 0$ , then the LP has no feasible solution.

All of the tests above are applied in a single pass. Since the reductions (if any) may make it possible to identify

new reductions, the complete analysis consists of repeated passes until no additional reductions are found. Table 2 displays the results for the sample problems. The times given are for execution on an IBM 360/67 using FORTRAN H (Extended) without code optimization.

With real-life LP (and MIP) models, a remarkably large fraction of model constraints can be removed by these simple techniques. For some cases, models have been nearly *solved* this way.

We have often been surprised at the number of reductions achieved after several passes. The repeated passes can serve to unravel a model and reveal special structure that is quite obscure in a static analysis.

Experiments with some of these reductions have been reported by Brearley, Mitra and Williams [7]. More extensive work at large scale has been done by Bradley, Brown and Graves [5] and by Krabek [14].

TABLE 2

## SIMPLE REDUCTIONS

MODEL	COLUMNS		CONSTRAINTS		REDUCTION PASSES	DOUBLETON EQUATIONS	360/67 SECONDS
	SINGLETION	FIXED	SINGLETION	REDUNDANT			
NETTING	1	8	29	17	4	7	0.81
AIRLP	0	20	0	0	2	0	1.78
COAL	0	0	0	0	2	0	2.12
TRUCK	0	2	0	1	2	0	5.57
CUPS	49	57	18	55	4	39	1.90
FERT	0	406	0	13	4	0	14.25
PIES	50	183	16	0	3	0	3.32
PAD	30	183	16	0	3	0	3.26
ELEC	56	494	120	14	4	3	8.64
GAS	60	501	31	30	4	0	10.08
PILOT	123	277	12	91	11	36	17.15
FOAM	0	2	36	0	2	0	3.30
LANG	220	105	68	55	20	9	61.45
JCAP	414	6	277	360	3	180	12.16
PAPER	190	145	90	45	5	359	20.61
ODSAS	40	0	0	40	3	3,609	31.00

### 3.2. Transformation Reductions

Equations confine the feasible region to an affine subspace of lower dimension. It is possible to eliminate an equation and a column with a nonzero coefficient in the equation. If  $a_{ik} \neq 0$  in an equation constraint  $i$ , then

$$x_k = (r^i - \sum_{j \neq k} a_{ij} x_j) / a_{ik}$$

can be used to eliminate  $x_k$  from the problem. The equation is eliminated but the bounds on  $x_k$  generate a constraint

$$l_k \leq (r^i - \sum_{j \neq k} a_{ij} x_j) / a_{ik} \leq u_k .$$

This elimination is equivalent to pivoting on  $a_{ik}$ . Although repeated application will remove all equations, this will not in general make the problem easier to solve or reduce the number of constraints.

There are two special cases where the elimination of a column can reduce the number of constraints. If the column  $x_k$  has no upper or lower bound (i.e. a "free" variable), then the generated constraint is redundant and thus may be eliminated.

If the equation has only two columns with nonzero coefficients, the generated constraint is a simple bound on a variable and thus may be combined with the existing bounds on the variable.

A particular type of constraint that is common to many models leads to an equation that has a nonzero coefficient for a column with no bounds. Commonly called *material balance equations*,

these constraints set one *nonnegative* column (i.e. with infinite upper bound) equal to the sum of several other nonnegative columns.

$$x_k - \sum_{j \in J} x_j = 0 ,$$

$$0 \leq x_k, \quad 0 \leq x_j, \quad j \in J .$$

Since the  $x_j$   $j \in J$  are all restricted to be nonnegative, it is easy to see that the bound  $x_k \geq 0$  is redundant--that is, if it is eliminated the feasible region is unchanged. Thus  $x_k$  can be regarded as a column with no bounds and the elimination of  $x_k$  will reduce the number of constraints by one.

Notice that although the analysis of the material balance equation results in removing the bound from  $x_k$ , when eliminating  $x_k$  any single equation that has a nonzero coefficient in column  $k$  can be substituted out.

The analysis applies to a generalization of material balance rows:

$$a_{ik}x_k + \sum_{j \in J} a_{ij}x_j = b_i ,$$

$$0 \leq x_k, \quad l_j \leq x_j \leq u_j ,$$

where  $a_{ik} > 0$ ,  $b_i$  and  $l_j \geq 0$  and  $a_{ij} < 0 \quad \forall j \in J$ . Although this is not the most general form which can be used to designate that the bound(s) on  $x_k$  are redundant, this form (and its negative) captures all the cases in the real-world problems that we have analyzed.

*Doubleton equations.* Equation constraints with exactly two nonzero coefficients can be identified for immediate elimination. The elimination of the equation and one of two columns is accomplished as described above, the generated inequality contains just a single nonzero coefficient so it can be removed by modifying the bounds on the surviving column.

*Free column equations.* An equation with a nonzero coefficient for a free column can be identified for immediate elimination along with the free column. The transformation to remove the constraint and column is equivalent to pivoting on the nonzero coefficient.

*Redundant bounds.* Our analysis uses only the generalized material balance equation to identify columns that have no bounds. It is possible to generalize this idea to include the use of all constraints to identify such columns. Each constraint may be used to generate bounds on all the columns with nonzero coefficients.

For constraint  $i$  with  $a_{ik} > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 - \sum_{\substack{a_{ij} > 0 \\ j \neq k}} a_{ij} u_j - \sum_{\substack{a_{ij} < 0 \\ j \neq k}} a_{ij} l_j + r_i &\leq a_{ik} x_k \\
 &\leq r^i - \sum_{\substack{a_{ij} > 0 \\ j \neq k}} a_{ij} l_j - \sum_{\substack{a_{ij} < 0 \\ j \neq k}} a_{ij} u_j .
 \end{aligned}$$

An analogous result can be constructed for  $a_{ik} < 0$ .

The intersection of these bounds from all the constraints infer bounds for column  $k$  which may reveal  $l_k$  and  $u_k$  to be

redundant and thus permit  $k$  to be designated a free column, or which can be used to tighten  $l_k$  and  $u_k$ .

Although this test can be done efficiently for any particular  $a_{ik}$ , there are potentially quite a large number of candidates to test. We have not included this test in our results here, and we further believe that there are few real LP problems for which this test yields significantly more columns without bounds than examination for generalized material balance equations.

One particular situation for which this test may be selectively applied is that in which a coefficient is much larger, or much smaller than its cohorts. In this case the inferred bounds may reveal infinitesimal or (respectively) gigantic bounds for  $x_k$ , possibly suggesting deletion of the column.

Table 2 shows doubleton equations found after the final simple reduction pass. Note the last model (ODSAS) for which almost all constraints are identified as doubleton equations.

A sample analysis for material balance equations performed on the PAPER model detected 1,645 such constraints.

It is not always obvious whether actually applying a particular transformation reduction will produce an LP model which is easier to solve. In particular, transformation reductions can generate a "reduced, equivalent LP" which is actually denser, and not necessarily as well-scaled as its progenitor.

On the other hand, some reductions offer a decided advantage for solution efficiency. For constraints like  $x_j - x_k = 0$ ,  $x_j, x_k \geq 0$ , both variables must be in the basis for them to assume a positive value. For many commercial linear

programming systems, partial pricing and the lack of effective mechanisms to cope with degeneracy do not allow the efficient treatment of the special relationship between the variables. Similarly, for material balance equations with nonnegative variables, at least two variables with coefficients of opposite sign must be in the basis before any of the variables can assume a positive value. The transformation reductions eliminate these particular instances where relationships among variables interfere with the solution progress.

For large-scale models, we analyze the reductions carefully, using *all* information available for the model and the problem it addresses. Numerical and structural consequences of reductions are critically reviewed in concert with the algebraic interpretations and modeling discoveries which they characterize.

Notice that both simple and transformation reductions may be viewed as linear operators that do not change the feasible region of the problem. After the reduced problem is solved, the inverse operators applied to the optimal solution construct an optimal solution to the original problem.

The analysis makes no special use of an objective function. Nonbinding constraints (that is, "free rows") may be included in the problem. The objective function and any free rows designated to be included are only examined in determining if a column has a single nonzero coefficient. Thus the reduction can be done for several different objective functions simultaneously.

### 3.3. Generalized Upper Bounds

Rows for which each column has at most one non-zero coefficient (restricted to those rows) collectively form a generalized upper bound (GUB) set. Usually, we additionally require that the coefficients in these rows be capable of being rendered to  $\pm 1$  by simple row or column scaling.

The problem of identifying a GUB set of *maximum* row dimension is NP-hard, making optimal GUB identification algorithms hopelessly inefficient for our purposes. Heuristics adapted from work by Graves and by Senju and Toyoda [18] (see also Brearley, Mitra and Williams [7]) work very effectively and dependably at large-scale to find *maximal* GUB sets.

Unfortunately, the problem of determining just the *size* of the maximum GUB set is also NP-hard. However, Brown and Thomen [9] have developed bounds on the size of the maximum GUB set which are sharp and easily computed. These bounds have been used to show, in some cases, that maximum GUB sets have been achieved via heuristic methods. In any case, the bounds provide an excellent objective measure of the quality of any GUB set, regardless of the means of its derivation. Frequently, manual GUB analysis will suffice for models with amenable structure.

The bounds are developed in terms of the number of distinct *conflicts* present in the model. Two rows are in conflict if they each have a non-zero element in a common column, making them mutually exclusive in a GUB set. If  $s_i$  is the number of rows in conflict with row  $i$ , then the total problem conflict count for a model with  $m$  rows is

$$c = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i s_i < \frac{1}{2} m(m-1) .$$

A problem-independent bound on the size of the maximum GUB set is

$$u_1 = \lfloor .5 + \sqrt{.25 + m(m-1) - 2c} \rfloor ,$$

where  $\lfloor$  indicates truncation to the next lower integer.

A tighter, problem-dependent bound is

$$u_2 = \begin{cases} m - \lceil \frac{c}{y} \rceil, & c \leq (m-y)y \\ \lfloor .5 + \sqrt{.25 + y(2m-y-1) - 2c} \rfloor, & c > (m-y)y \end{cases} ;$$

where

$$y = \max_i s_i ,$$

and  $\lceil$  indicates rounding to the next higher integer.

Tighter upper bounds have been derived for the size of the maximum GUB set, as well as lower bounds.

Table 3 contains the results of automatic GUB identification applied to the benchmark models. Constraint eligibility is based on the capability to scale the row to contain only 0,  $\pm 1$  coefficients. *GUB quality* is the number of GUB rows found, expressed as a percentage of the best known upper bound on maximum GUB row dimension (actual GUB quality may be better than this conservative estimate). The results were obtained using FORTRAN H (Extended) with code optimization.

TABLE 3

## GUB IDENTIFICATION

MODEL	CONSTRAINTS		CONSTRAINT CONFLICTS		GUB	
	GUB-ELIGIBLE	COUNT	DENSITY	ROWS	QUALITY	SECONDS
NETTING	71	46	1.85%	36	78.26%	0.05
AIRLP	170	2,983	20.64%	150	100%	0.65
COAL	170	3,753	26.13%	111	91.74%	0.92
TRUCK	219	10,438	43.53%	29	20.28%	5.00
CUPS	336	744	1.32%	160	66.67%	0.21
FERT	605	16,455	9.01%	559	98.59%	6.73
PIES	662	4,116	1.88%	172	40.76%	2.82
PAD	694	4,416	1.84%	188	41.87%	3.34
ELEC	784	6,167	2.01%	309	62.80%	1.15
GAS	789	22,220	7.15%	608	93.25%	3.79
PILOT	975	12,110	2.55%	255	33.73%	2.75
FOAM	989	8,186	1.67%	917	98.18%	1.73
LANG	1,235	46,424	6.09%	342	35.15%	14.90
JCAP	2,446	16,578	0.55%	529	29.19%	2.23
PAPER	3,528	35,047	2.82%	1041	34.65%	5.77
ODSAS	4,647	5,220	0.05%	749	18.61%	7.12

### 3.4. Implicit Network Rows

Implicit network rows are a set of rows for which each column has at most two non-zero coefficients (restricted to those rows) and for which columns with two non-zero coefficients (in those rows) can be converted by *simple* row and column scaling such that the non-zero coefficients have opposite sign. Such rows in LP are commonly called networks with gains.

Pure network rows (NET) can be converted by *simple* row and column scaling such that all non-zero coefficients (restricted to those rows) have value  $\pm 1$ , and such that columns with two non-zero coefficients (in those rows) have one  $+1$  and one  $-1$ . Such rows in LP are called pure networks.

Simple row and column scaling is restricted such that application of each scale factor renders an entire row, or column, to the desired sign (and unit magnitude for pure NET).

The problem of identifying a NET factorization of *maximum* row dimension is NP-hard (Wright [18]), making optimal NET identification algorithms unattractive in a practical sense. The problem of determining just the *size* of the maximum NET set is also NP-hard. Thus, heuristic identification methods are mandated.

An extension of GUB heuristics can be used to achieve NET factorizations. First, a GUB set is determined by methods mentioned in Section 3.3. Then, a second GUB set is found from an eligible subset of remaining rows. The second GUB set is conditioned such that its row members must possess non-zero coefficients of opposite sign in each column for which the prior GUB set has a non-zero coefficient.

This double-GUB (DGUB) identification yields a *bipartite* NET factorization. Thus, DGUB heuristically seeks the maximum embedded transportation or assignment row factorization. Pure network equivalents derive from proper editing of eligible rows.

Generalizing on the theme of Senju and Toyoda, a more general method has been developed by Brown and Wright [10] for direct factorization of implicit network rows. Pure NET rows are identified with the same procedure by simple screening of admissible candidate rows.

This heuristic is designed to perform a network factorization of a signed elementary matrix (0,  $\pm 1$  entries only). It is a deletion heuristic which is feasibility seeking. The measure of infeasibility at any point is a matrix penalty computed as the sum of individual row penalties. The algorithm is two-phased, one pass, and non-backtracking. The first phase yields a feasible set of rows, while the second phase attempts to improve the set by reincluding rows previously excluded. Each iteration in Phase I either deletes a row or reflects it (multiplies it by -1) and guarantees that the matrix penalty will be reduced. Thus, the number of iterations in Phase I is bounded by the initial value of the matrix penalty, which is polynomially bounded.

Let  $A = [a_{ij}]$  be an  $m \times n$  matrix with  $a_{ij} = 0, \pm 1 \forall i, j$ .

Problem: Find a matrix  $N = [n_{ij}]$  with  $(m-k)$  rows and  $n$  columns which is derived from  $A$  by

1. Deleting  $k$  rows of  $A$  where  $k \geq 0$ ,
2. Multiplying zero or more rows of  $A$  by  $-1$ ,

where  $N$  has the property that each column of  $N$  has at most one  $+1$  element and at most one  $-1$  element.

We wish to find a "large"  $N$  in the sense of containing as many rows as possible, i.e. minimize  $k$ .

#### Terminology and Notation:

1.  $E$  is the set of row indices for rows eligible for inclusion in  $N$  and is called the eligible set.
2.  $C$  is the set of row indices for rows removed from  $E$  in Phase I (Deletion). Some rows in  $C$  may be readmitted to  $E$  in Phase II.  $C$  is called the candidate set.
3. The phrase "reflect row  $i'$  of  $A$ " means to multiply each element in row  $i'$  by  $-1$ , i.e.  $a_{i'j} \leftarrow -a_{i'j} \forall j$ .
4. Other notation will be defined in the algorithm itself.

#### ALGORITHM:

##### Phase I - *Deletion of Infeasible Rows*

Step 0: *Initialization.* Set  $E = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ ,  $C = \emptyset$ .

For each column  $j$  of  $A$  compute the  $+$  penalty  $(K_j^+)$  and the  $-$  penalty  $(K_j^-)$  as follows:

$$K_j^+ = \left( \sum_{i \in E: a_{ij} > 0} 1 \right) - 1, \quad K_j^- = \left( \sum_{i \in E: a_{ij} < 0} 1 \right) - 1.$$

These penalties represent the number of excess  $+1$  and  $-1$  elements, respectively, in column  $j$  which prevent the rows whose indices remain in  $E$  from forming a valid  $N$  matrix.

A penalty value of  $-1$  for  $K_j^+(K_j^-)$  indicates that the column does not contain a  $+1(-1)$  element.

Step 1: *Define Row Penalties.* For every  $i \in E$ , compute a row penalty  $(p_i)$  as follows:

$$p_i = \sum_{j: a_{ij} > 0} K_j^+ + \sum_{j: a_{ij} < 0} K_j^- .$$

This is simply the sum of  $+$  penalties for all columns in which row  $i$  has a  $+1$  plus the sum of  $-$  penalties for all columns in which row  $i$  has a  $-1$ .

Step 2: *Define Matrix Penalty.* Compute the penalty  $(h)$  for the matrix by summing the row penalties as follows:

$$h = \sum_{i \in E} p_i .$$

If  $h = 0$ , then go to Step 7. Otherwise, go to Step 3.

Step 3: *Row Selection.* Find the row  $i' \in E$  with the greatest penalty, i.e.

$$\text{Find } i' \in E \text{ such that } p_{i'} = \max_{i \in E} p_i .$$

(If there is a tie, choose  $i'$  from among the tied values.)

Compute the reflected row penalty  $\bar{p}_{i'}$  for  $i'$  as follows:

$$\bar{p}_{i'} = \sum_{j: a_{i'j} > 0} (K_j^- + 1) + \sum_{j: a_{i'j} < 0} (K_j^+ + 1) .$$

This would be the row penalty for row  $i'$  if it were to be reflected.

Step 4: *Delete, or Reflect Row.*

Case i)  $\bar{p}_{i'} \geq p_{i'}$  . Let  $E \leftarrow E - \{i'\}$ ,  $C \leftarrow C \cup \{i'\}$ . Go to Step 5.

Case ii)  $\bar{p}_{i'} < p_{i'}$  . Reflect row  $i'$ . Go to Step 6.

Step 5: *Reduce column penalties as follows:*

For all  $j$  such that  $a_{i'j} > 0$ ,  $K_j^+ \leftarrow K_j^+ - 1$  .

For all  $j$  such that  $a_{i'j} < 0$ ,  $K_j^- \leftarrow K_j^- - 1$  .

Go to Step 1.

Step 6: *Change column penalties as follows:*

Using the  $a_{i'j}$  values after reflection of row  $i'$ ,

For all  $j$  such that  $a_{i'j} > 0$ ,  $K_j^+ \leftarrow K_j^+ + 1$  and  $K_j^- \leftarrow K_j^- - 1$  .

For all  $j$  such that  $a_{i'j} < 0$ ,  $K_j^+ \leftarrow K_j^+ - 1$  and  $K_j^- \leftarrow K_j^- + 1$  .

Go to Step 1.

Phase II - *Reinclusion of Rows from C*

Step 7: *Eliminate Conflicting Rows.* The rows with indices in  $E$ , some possibly reflected from the original  $A$  matrix, form a valid  $N$  matrix. However, some of the rows removed from  $E$  and placed in  $C$  may now be reincluded in  $E$  if they do not make  $h > 0$ . Remove from  $C$  (and discard) all row indices for rows which, if reincluded in  $E$  in present or reflected form, would make  $h > 0$ .

i.e. Remove  $i$  from  $C$  if

a)  $\exists j_1$  such that  $a_{ij_1} > 0$  and  $K_{j_1}^+ = 0$  ,

or  $a_{ij_1} < 0$  and  $K_{j_1}^- = 0$  ;

and

b)  $\exists j_2$  such that  $a_{ij_2} > 0$  and  $K_{j_2}^- = 0$  ,

or  $a_{ij_2} < 0$  and  $K_{j_2}^+ = 0$  .

If  $C = \phi$ , STOP, otherwise go to Step 8.

Step 8: *Select Row for Reinclusion.* At this point a row from  $C$  may be reincorporated in  $E$ . There are several possible schemes for selecting the row. After the row is reincorporated, the column penalties are adjusted. Then go to Step 7.

No dominating rule has been discovered for breaking ties in maximum row penalty encountered in Step 3. The rule used for the computational results presented herein is to select the row with the minimum number of non-zero entries in an attempt to place a larger number of non-zero entries in the network set. Other possible rules are "first-come, first-served," maximum number of non-zero entries, type of constraint, or modeler preference.

Modifications can be made to Step 0 to allow for 1) Matrices including non- 0,  $\pm 1$  entries and/or 2) Pre-specified network rows. The modifications are:

1.  $E = \{i \mid a_{ij} = 0, \pm 1 \text{ for all } j\} ,$
2. Let  $P = \{i \mid \text{row } i \text{ is prespecified}\} ,$   
 $E \leftarrow E - P .$   
 After computation of  $K_j^+$  and  $K_j^-$ , find for all  $j :$   
 if  $\exists i \in P$  such that  $a_{ij} = 1$  then  $K_j^+ \leftarrow K_j^+ + 1 ,$   
 if  $\exists i \in P$  such that  $a_{ij} = -1$  then  $K_j^- \leftarrow K_j^- + 1 .$

At termination of the algorithm, the rows in  $N$  are given by  $E \cup P$ .

One easily obtained upper bound on the maximum row dimension of the network factorization is:

$$u_1 = m - \max_j (K_j^+ + K_j^-) .$$

This bound is easily computed and evidently sharp. It can be used to objectively evaluate the quality of a heuristically derived network factorization. The bound may also be used to preemptively terminate identification effort.

Another, generally tighter bound has been developed by Wright [19] which is based on the reflection and deletion potentials for each row in the eligible set. Using this information it is possible to obtain a lower bound on the number of rows which must be deleted to achieve a feasible network set. The upper bound is then:

$$u_2 = m - \text{lower bound on rows deleted.}$$

This bound is also evidently sharp and is the bound used to compute NET quality in the following table.

Table 4 displays the results of DGUB and NET factorizations of the benchmark models. Row eligibility is determined by the capability to scale each row, by row scaling alone, to contain only  $0, \pm 1$  entries. The *NET quality* is the number of NET rows found, expressed as a percentage of the upper bound on maximum NET row dimension given above (actual NET quality may be considerably better than this estimate).

TABLE 4

NET IDENTIFICATION

MODEL	CONSTRAINTS NET-ELIGIBLE	DGUB		NET	
		ROWS	SECONDS	ROWS	QUALITY SECONDS
NETTING	59	54	0.07	54	94.74%
AIRLP	150	150	0.41	150	100%
COAL	111	111	0.50	111	100%
TRUCK	219	47	8.40	46	33.58%
CUPS	300	251	0.29	295	99.33%
FERT	585	572	6.03	572	100%
PIES	142	128	0.56	128	96.97%
PAD	174	160	0.58	160	97.56%
ELEC	322	272	0.99	286	93.46%
GAS	752	682	5.00	668	94.08%
PILOT	109	109	0.92	109	100%
FOAM	966	951	1.89	951	99.58%
LANG	850	585	3.74	661	87.20%
JCAP	1,811	874	2.50	917	83.97%
PAPER	2,324	1,484	7.24	1,627	78.52%
ODSAS	410	317	3.39	286	77.51%

### 3.5. Hidden Network Rows

Hidden network rows<sup>†</sup> are a set of rows which satisfy NET row restrictions after full linear transformation of the model. That is, realization of these (LNET) rows may require a general linear transformation of the original model.

The discrimination between *implicit* and *hidden network* rows is not (necessarily) in their use, but rather in their detection. The transformation group associated with implicit network rows involves *only* permutations and simple scaling of individual rows and columns. The hidden network rows require a completely general linear transformation and partial ordering. Thus, identification of hidden networks requires significant computation just to identify eligible rows, since any given row may conflict with subsets of its cohorts after transformation.

This problem has been solved for *entire* hidden network factorization, where all rows are shown to be LNET or the algorithm fails. Bixby and Cunningham [2] and Muslem [16] have given polynomially complex methods for entire LNET conversion. (The entire GUB problem is polynomial as well.)

Strategically, the entire hidden LNET factorization requires two steps:

*DETECTION:* necessary conditions for existence of an entire LNET factorization must be established, and

*SCALING:* a linear transformation to achieve the NET structure must be determined, if one exists.

---

<sup>†</sup>We have coopted the term *hidden* from Bixby [1], but his definition may not superficially appear to be equivalent.

Cunningham and Bixby attempt detection, followed by scaling. Musalem tries scaling, then detection. This is a crucial difference between methods, since problems which can not be completely NET factorized may fail in either step.

Briefly, Cunningham and Bixby *detect* by showing that the incidence matrix of the model rows can be converted to a graphic matroid. They employ a method by Tutte (see references of Bixby and Cunningham). Given success, the graphic record of the detection is used to attempt to *scale* the model to NET, or to show that no such scaling exists.

Musalem *scales* the model to a  $\pm 1$  matrix, and then uses a method by Iri (see references of Musalem) to build a tree, edge by edge, which reveals the partial ordering coincident with entire hidden LNET factorization.

Both methods are polynomially complex. However, entire LNET factorization is relatively expensive by either method in that quite a large amount of real arithmetic and logic is required. Underlying data structures have not been suggested for either method. Both methods fail if complete LNET factorization is impossible, and neither leaves the investigator with much information useful in salvaging a partial LNET factorization. We conjecture that risk of preemptive failure narrowly favors the Musalem approach, since he defers the relatively involved detection step.

Locating a hidden LNET factorization of *maximal* row dimension has been suggested by Bixby [1] and by Musalem, but no concrete method is given and no computational testing is

reported. Evidently, the *maximum* LNET problem is NP-hard, and its maximal relaxation remains unsolved in the practical sense of this report.

#### 4. EXTENSIONS TO MIXED INTEGER AND NONLINEAR MODELS

Mixed integer (MIP) and nonlinear (NLP) optimization models present additional challenges, especially at large scale. Our interest in the detection of structural redundancy is intensified since general purpose algorithms for (MIP) and (NLP) normally operate by solving *sequences* of *many* embedded LP models. This provides added impetus to the analysis of problems prior to their actual solution, and economically justifies some additional initial investment in problem analysis.

##### 4.1. Mixed Integer Extensions

The structural analysis presented for LP is also applicable to MIP. Since most real-world models and many commercial optimization systems have only *binary* variable capability, our analysis addresses binary variables exclusively. Thus, binary expansion of integer variables is a prerequisite. We also assume that reductions requiring scaling of binary columns are inadmissible.

When a reduction tightens a bound for a discrete variable the bound is rounded to the nearest integer (down for  $u_j$  and up for  $l_j$ ). Any tightening of bounds for a binary variable immediately results in a fixed column or an inconsistent column. The reductions for fixed columns, vacuous columns, inconsistent columns, singleton constraints, vacuous constraints, constraints that fix variables, and redundant constraints are applied exactly as described for LP.

The treatment of doubleton equations requires special consideration to identify inconsistent constraints.

A doubleton equation with both columns binary has either one solution, two solutions or no solutions. All four possible solutions  $(0,0)$ ,  $(1,0)$ ,  $(0,1)$  and  $(1,1)$  are tried.

If only one solves the equation, the binary variables are fixed at these values and the constraint is removed (the test for constraints that fix variables will also discover the equation with a single solution and accomplish the same reduction).

For the case with two solutions there can only be two situations: consider the doubleton as  $a_{i1}x_1 + a_{i2}x_2 = b_i$  with  $a_{i1} \neq 0$  and  $a_{i2} \neq 0$ . Then if  $(0,0)$  and  $(1,1)$  can both solve the equation, this implies that  $b = 0$  and  $a_{i1} = -a_{i2}$ . If  $(0,1)$  and  $(1,0)$  are solutions, this implies that  $a_{i1} = a_{i2} = b$ . Both cases are treated correctly by the transformation described for continuous variables.

If there are no solutions, the constraint is designated as inconsistent.

For a doubleton equation with one continuous and one binary variable, the transformation described for continuous variables is used, but it must be the continuous variable that is eliminated.

The reductions to eliminate singleton columns and to designate a free column equation may not be applied to binary variables. This is ensured by marking the binary columns as ineligible for these reductions. Note that since a binary variable can never be designated as a free column, binary variables cannot be eliminated as a variable in a free column constraint but may be among the other columns in such a constraint.

The redundant bounds test may be used to tighten bounds on binary variables and thus fix them, or show that the MIP has no feasible solution.

#### 4.2. Nonlinear Extensions

Large-scale nonlinear optimization, though not yet in wide use, can benefit from the analysis techniques given here for LP, and demands some additional special treatment.

We have experience with only two large-scale, general-purpose optimization systems with full nonlinear capability: our own X-system and MINOS / Augmented [17]. Both of these systems can accept linear problem features and labels in MPS format and nonlinear terms from function generators. Both systems can also employ several alternate problem generation interface standards.

These systems are each designed to exploit any linearity or near-linearity in the NLP. Given a starting solution, it is of no little interest to analyze the linear portion of the NLP which will, after all, be solved many times--the reason that we support *all* LP features for NLP. Also, any local linearization of the NLP is subject to analysis.

However, it has been our misfortune to have repeatedly discovered that NLP presents us with unique structural curiosities.

We refer to the foremost among these as *function coordination*. There are myriad opportunities with NLP to unwittingly introduce discontinuities and miscellaneous unruliness in functions and derivatives. Whether by programming error, mathematical blunder or numerical difficulty, these errors inflict great vexation and expense.

Detection of such difficulties is quite challenging since, unlike LP, procedures and data are used to express the problem at hand. As a bare minimum, we employ a preemptive analysis

module that acts as a complete surrogate for the optimizer, employing standard interface conventions and exercising all functions and data.

The starting solution and scaling parameters are used to check analytic gradients (if supplied) with numerical difference approximations. Approximation of functions is then attempted to reveal behavior local to the initial solution such as apparent convexity and degree of nonlinearity. Optionally, the first step of the algorithm is simulated and the same analyses performed.

From initial results algorithm tolerances may be changed, programming errors detected, and so forth, until acceptable model behavior is observed.

In some cases, suspicious functions may be evaluated at column bounds to see if numerical arithmetic faults occur. Some models require construction and maintenance of a *trust region* for the approximations implied by the NLP algorithm, and prior analysis is absolutely essential in these cases.

Structural analysis of MIP and NLP can frequently--even repeatedly--presage outright failure of the solution algorithms to be employed. For these models, the effects of structural redundancy can be far more significant than for simple LP.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The techniques reported here have been used with great success on a wide variety of large LP (MIP) models. The context of this research is somewhat atypical in that the models which we work with are often sent to us for analysis and solution precisely because they have already failed elsewhere. In these cases, our motives are to quickly diagnose suspected trouble before optimization, prescribe remedies, and perform the actual optimization reliably and efficiently.

This has undoubtedly biased our view of structural detection methods. Practical considerations arising from turnaround deadlines and the specific advantages of our own optimization system (Brown and Graves [8])<sup>†</sup> have colored our judgment. Many provocative suggestions for further research have not been pursued, either due to lack of opportunity, to poor intuition, or to simple economics. Whether or not by equivalent prejudice, Krabek [14] reports some similar methods for detecting redundancy in large-scale MIP.

Various commercial optimization systems support "CRASH," "REDUCE," and other operators which implement some of these reductions automatically during LP solution. These systems are not reviewed here. We stress the value of structural analysis

---

<sup>†</sup>The *X*-system (XS) differs in many ways from classical large-scale mathematical programming systems; it simultaneously supports simple and generalized upper bounds, general basis factorization, MIP, nonlinear, and decomposition features. In addition, the fundamental LP algorithm has been enhanced to intrinsically incorporate *elastic* range restrictions. XS is particularly suited for solution in limited time of large models with complicating features.

techniques as *stand-alone* tools, rather than as exclusive features of actual LP-solution algorithms.

A great deal of insight has been gained from these experiments. The cost of analysis is truly insignificant relative to the information and solution efficiency gained thereby. Revelations have ranged from outright rejection of absurd formulations, to subtle inferences on the project management and inter-personal relations among model proponents. Very few models fail to reveal some totally unsuspected structural curiosity. Indeed, it is often some small aberration that proves most revealing. Sometimes, the combined effects of several minor features collectively contribute to a discovery of significant model attributes.

Our general operational guideline has been to avoid heavy computational investment in model analysis. Rather, highly efficient methods are used *repeatedly* on variations of each model. Manual and *intuitive* analysis of these results usually reveal much more than could be reasonably expected from any totally automated method of exponential complexity. After all, just the *names* of rows and columns can be expected to reveal a great deal about the model, but exploiting this mathematically virtually defies automation in any general sense; interactive analysis of large-scale models is uncompromisingly challenging in a technical sense and equally rewarding.

Large degrees of structural redundancy are routinely found as intrinsic features in real-life models. However, we feel that it is an abominable practice to proselytize in favor of some particular model structure at the expense of model realism or common sense.

For instance, network models have recently received unprecedented attention in the literature. The implication has often been that since networks are usually found in models, networks should be used as the exclusive model. This is, of course, patent nonsense, smacking of a solution in search of a problem. An analyst should view intrinsic redundancy as an interesting feature of models, rather than forcing models to exhibit minimal redundancy, or requiring that they follow some particular structural pattern.

As for automating the discovery of *all* redundancy in a model, this exercise seems to be almost exclusively academic with large-scale, real-life LP projects. In those rare cases for which such extensive analysis is justified, we suggest a straightforward view and a frontal attack with an imbedded LP optimizer.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

David Thomen has developed much of the GUB identification material, and William Wright has contributed fundamentally to the network identification research. Both gentlemen have suffered nobly with us the singular exasperation of experimentation at large scale.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [1] Bixby, R., "Hidden and Embedded Structure in Linear Programs," paper presented at the Symposium in Computer-Assisted Analysis and Model Simplification, Boulder, 24 March 1980.
- [2] Bixby, R. and Cunningham, W., "Converting Linear Programs to Network Problems," Mathematics of Operations Research, Vol. 5, p. 321 (1980).
- [3] Bradley, G., "Analysis of IIES and PIES Mathematical Programs," Fed. Energy Admin. Internal Report (August 1976).
- [4] Bradley, G., Brown, G. and Galatas, P., "ATHENA: An Interactive System to Analyze Large-Scale Optimization Models," Naval Postgraduate School Technical Report NPS52-80-005, (April 1980).
- [5] Bradley, G., Brown, G. and Graves, G., "Preprocessing Large-Scale Optimization Models," paper presented at ORSA/TIMS, Atlanta (November 1977).
- [6] Bradley, G., Brown, G. and Graves, G., "Design and Implementation of Large-Scale Primal Transshipment Algorithms," Management Science, Vol. 24, No. 1, p. 1 (1977).
- [7] Bready, A., Mitra, G. and Williams, H., "Analysis of Mathematical Programming Problems Prior to Applying the Simplex Algorithm," Mathematical Programming, Vol. 8, p. 54 (1978).
- [8] Brown, G. and Graves, G., "Design and Implementation of a Large-Scale (Mixed Integer) Optimization System," paper presented at ORSA/TIMS, Las Vegas, November 1975.
- [9] Brown, G. and Thomen, D., "Automatic Identification of Generalized Upper Bounds in Large-Scale Optimization Models," Technical Report NPS55-80-003, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey (January 1980) (to appear in Management Science).
- [10] Brown, G. and Wright, W., "Automatic Identification of Network Rows in Large-Scale Optimization Models," (in Proceedings of the Symposium of Computer-Assisted Analysis and Model Simplification, Boulder, March 24, 1980, and forthcoming in a collection of papers from IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria).
- [11] Graves, G., "A Complete Constructive Algorithm for the General Mixed Linear Programming Problem," Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 1 (1965).
- [12] Graves, G. and McBride, R., "The Factorization Approach to Large-Scale Linear Programming," Mathematical Programming, Vol. 10, p. 91 (1976).

- [13] Graves, G. and Van Roy, T., "Decomposition for Large-Scale Linear and Mixed Integer Linear Programming," (to appear in Mathematical Programming) (November 1979).
- [14] Krabek, C., "Some Experiments in Mixed Integer Matrix Reduction," paper presented at XXIV International TIMS Meeting, Honolulu, June 18, 1979.
- [15] McBride, R., "Factorization in Large-Scale Linear Programming," Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA (1973).
- [16] Musalem. S., "Converting Linear Models to Network Models," Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA (December 1979).
- [17] Saunders, M. and Murtagh, B., "MINOS/Augmented Users Manual," Stanford U., Technical Report SOL 80-14 (June 1980).
- [18] Senju, S. and Toyoda, R., "An Approach to Linear Programming with 0-1 Variables," Management Science, Vol. 15, p. B196 (1968).
- [19] Wright, W., "Automatic Identification of Network Rows in Large-Scale Optimization Models," M.S. Thesis, Naval Post-graduate School (May 1980).

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

	No. of Copies
Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	2
Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	2
Library, Code 55 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Dean of Research Code 012A Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Office of Naval Research Code 434 Arlington, VA 22217	1
Professor G. H. Bradley, Code 52 Professor G. G. Brown, Code 55Bw Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	30 30





DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY



3 2768 00347372 9